UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2593rd MEETING: 17 JUNE 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2593)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia:	
(*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);	
(*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);	
(*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2593rd MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 17 June 1985, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Errol MAHABIR (Trinidad and Tobago).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2593)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in Namibia:
   (*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);
   (*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);
   (*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)

The meeting was called to order at 11.15 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:
(*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);
(*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);
(*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite the representative of Liberia to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kofa (Liberia) took a place at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Ouyahia, Acting President, and the other members of the delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia took a place at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite Mr. Nujoma to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nujoma took a place at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings on this item [*2583rd to 2587th, 2589th, 2590th and 2592nd meetings*], I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, the Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Seychelles, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Bessaieh (Algeria), Mr. Van-Dunem (Angola), Mr. Muñiz (Argentina), Mr. Choudhury (Bangladesh), Mr. Moseley (Barbados), Mr. Tshering (Bhutan), Mrs. Carrasco (Bolivia), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Maciel (Brazil), Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Engo (Cameroon), Mr. Lewis (Canada), Mr. Gayama (Congo), Mr. Malmierca (Cuba), Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Mr. César (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Dinka (Ethiopia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Lautenschlager (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Asamoah (Ghana), Mr. Sinclair (Guyana), Mr. Charles (Haiti), Mr. Foldeak (Hungary), Mr. Kusumaatmadja (Indonesia), Mr. Shearer (Jamaica), Mr. Kuroda (Japan), Mr. Kiilu (Kenya), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr.

Vongsay (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Makeka (Lesotho), Mr. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Zain (Malaysia), Mr. Gauci (Malta), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico), Mr. Nyamdoo (Mongolia), Mr. Alaoui (Morocco), Mr. Murargy (Mozambique), Mr. D'Escoto Brockmann (Nicaragua), Mr. Gambari (Nigeria), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Cabrera Jovane (Panama), Mr. Nowak (Poland), Ms. Gonthier (Seychelles), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Wijewardane (Sri Lanka), Mr. Birido (Sudan), Mr. Al-Atassi (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Türkmen (Turkey), Mr. Odaka (Uganda), Mr. Al-Mosfir, (United Arab Emirates), Mr. Mkapa (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia), Mr. Goma (Zambia) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

5. The PRESIDENT: I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to document S/17272, which contains the text of a letter dated 13 June 1985 from the representative of Venezuela to the Secretary-General.

6. The first speaker is the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Mr. Abdul G. Koroma. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

7. Mr. KOROMA (Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples): Since its inception, and in the discharge of the mandate entrusted to it, namely, to ensure that peoples of dependent Territories exercise their legitimate right to self-determination and independence, the Special Committee has considered the question of Namibia's independence to be of supreme importance. This year, as it commemorates the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Special Committee's commitment to and determination to work towards Namibia's freedom and independence have become even more resolute. It is for this reason that we have requested the Council's permission to speak to make known the Special Committee's latest position on this all-important matter.

8. Before proceeding further, however, I wish, on behalf of the Special Committee and on my own personal behalf, to congratulate you, Sir, on assuming the presidency for this month. It is with considerable interest and hope that the Special Committee views the assumption of the presidency by Trinidad and Tobago, the country which you so ably represent in this body, on this important occasion, for your country is a firm believer in the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and a courageous defender of the principles of the Non-Aligned Movement. Furthermore, the commitment of the people and the Government of Trinidad and Tobago to the cause of colonial peoples and their outstanding contribution to the work of the United Nations in the field of decolonization, in particular as an exemplary member of the Special Committee, give us hope that, under your stewardship, the just cause of the freedom and independence of the Namibian people will make further advances.

9. I should like also to congratulate the representative of Thailand on the excellent manner in which he presided over the affairs of the Council last month. We acknowledge with gratitude and appreciation the steadfast support of his Government and his people for the cause of the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence.

10. The importance and urgency attached to the situation in Namibia are clearly demonstrated by the active participation in these Council meetings of a number of ministers and other high officials from all regions of the world. Indeed, the current series of meetings of the Council constitute an unequivocal demonstration of the serious concern shared by members of the Group of African States, the Non-Aligned Movement and, indeed, the international community as a whole about the current turn of events with regard to the Territory, and underscore our determination to see that all effective measures open to the United Nations are taken to eliminate a situation which constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security.

11. South Africa's open defiance of the will of the international community in respect of Namibia and South Africa is a damaging affront to the Organization, and must not be permitted to continue any further, as it seriously undermines the very principles on the basis of which it was founded.

12. As members of the Council are aware, South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its denial of the right to self-determination of the Namibian people constitute serious breaches of its international obligations, which renders it criminally reprehensible. Accordingly, the international community, as institutionalized by the Council, is under the obligation to continue to deny recognition to the illegal situation created by South Africa, to deny aid or assistance to South Africa in maintaining that situation, and to terminate its illegal presence in Namibia forthwith.

13. As members of the Council are also aware, the Special Committee held at Tunis from 13 to 17 May 1985 an extraordinary session in observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Following extensive deliberations on the theme of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration, the main focus of which was on Namibia, the Special Committee, guided by its mandate to ensure that the peoples of colonial Territories and countries are enabled to exercise their right to self-determination and independence, adopted unanimously—I repeat: unanimously—a decision on the question of Namibia.[1]

14. In that consensus decision, the Special Committee, among other things, holds the *apartheid* régime of South Africa accountable for creating a situation which seriously threatens international peace and security, as a result of its persistent non-compliance with and violations of United Nations resolutions and decisions, its ruthless resort to

repression of and violence against the Namibian people, its repeated acts of aggression, subversion and destabilization against neighbouring States, its continued manoeuvres to subvert the implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978), and its sinister attempts to impose on the people of Namibia an internal settlement.

15. The Special Committee categorically rejects and denounces all manoeuvres by South Africa to bring about a sham independence in Namibia through fraudulent constitutional and political schemes designed to perpetuate its colonial domination, including the latest attempts by the Pretoria régime to impose an internal settlement through the so-called Multi-Party Conference, and to establish an interim government.

16. The Special Committee is convinced that any political solution to the Namibian situation must be based on the immediate and unconditional termination of South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory, the withdrawal of its armed forces and the free and unfettered exercise by the Namibian people of their right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960. Thus, the Special Committee calls for the immediate implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978), the only acceptable basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question, without modification, qualification or pre-conditions.

17. In condemning the continued military, nuclear and intelligence collaboration between South Africa and certain countries as constituting a violation of the arms embargo imposed by the Council against South Africa in its resolution 418 (1977), the Special Committee urges that the Security Council adopt further measures to widen the scope of the embargo in order to make it more effective and comprehensive.

18. Furthermore, the Special Committee recommends that the Council act, and act decisively, against any dilatory manoeuvres and fraudulent schemes of the illegal occupation régime aimed at frustrating the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people. Aware that the Council has been prevented from discharging effectively its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security in the region owing to the opposition of certain of its permanent members, the Special Committee recommends that the Council respond, and respond positively, to the overwhelming demand of the international community by imposing forthwith comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under the terms of Chapter VII of the Charter.

19. These and other equally important recommendations are embodied in the decision adopted unanimously by the Special Committee at its extraordinary session. On behalf of the Special Committee, I commend them to the serious attention of members of the Council. The repeated attempts to bring about an independent, stable, self-governing and democratic Namibia, by the exercise of reason and through negotiations at an international level, have been ignored and, worse yet, ridiculed by the racist régime, as has been amply demonstrated by its recent act of aggression against Botswana.

20. As representative of Sierra Leone, I should like to say in this context that my Government has learned with indignation of South Africa's latest lawless behaviour in carrying out a wanton act of armed aggression against Botswana, which resulted in the death of innocent men and women, and at least one six-year-old child. The Government of Sierra Leone strongly condemns that wanton use of force and that act of brigandage by South Africa against a Member State. This latest attempt to intimidate an independent African State, or to cow it into submission and to make it accept a so-called treaty of non-aggression with ignominious conditions, is bound to fail. South Africa is deluding itself if it believes that *apartheid* and internal peace are compatible or can coexist. Moreover, South Africa's acts of aggression and destabilization against independent African States constitute a serious threat to the peace and security of that region.

21. The Government of Sierra Leone therefore calls upon the Council to ensure that South Africa desist from its illegal and aggressive behaviour. In this connection, Sierra Leone welcomes the condemnation of the raid by the international community, and in particular by the United States and the United Kingdom Governments. South Africa should be left in no doubt that it can find sympathy in no quarter for its illegal use of force. South Africa's latest action against an independent and peaceful Botswana is further demonstration that it cannot be trusted and that it cannot be regarded as a respectable member of the international community. Furthermore, it demonstrates that South Africa is not interested in a peaceful solution to the problems of *apartheid* that it has itself created.

22. The time is therefore overdue for the Council to act positively by imposing on South Africa a comprehensive programme of economic sanctions. At the same time, measures must be adopted without delay to extend all possible assistance to the struggling people of Namibia under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). That is the very least we should expect if we are not to see the present armed struggle degenerate into a full-scale war with all its dire consequences.

23. Before concluding, may I be permitted to express my deep appreciation to States members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries for having taken this important initiative to call for this series of Council meetings on the situation in Namibia. With the full co-operation of the members of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), I have no doubt whatsoever that the decisions adopted by the Council during these meetings will prove to be a decisive factor in restoring to the people of Namibia their long-denied human dignity and freedom. Delay is the worst form of denial.

24. In conclusion, I wish to express my appreciation for this opportunity to address the Council in connection with its consideration of the critical situation which prevails in the Territory of Namibia at this moment in time.

25. I should also like to pay a particular tribute to our Secretary-General for his tireless endeavours in the search

for a satisfactory solution to the problem of Namibia and his personal commitment to the cause of the people of Namibia.

26. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Zimbabwe. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

27. Mr. MUDENGE (Zimbabwe): Let me begin, Sir, by congratulating you most sincerely on your assumption of the presidency for the month of June. My delegation is confident that your wisdom, experience and vast diplomatic skills will enable you successfully to guide the deliberations of the Council.

28. I also wish to join the many others who have spoken before me in extending appreciation to your predecessor, the representative of Thailand, for the competent and outstanding manner in which he presided over the affairs of the Council during the month of May.

29. And, finally, I am grateful to you and your colleagues in the Council for allowing my delegation to participate in the debate on the question of Namibia.

30. Before I make my statement on Namibia, I wish to draw the attention of the members of the Council to a statement issued by my Government on the bloody events in Gaborone last week [*S/17278, annex*].

31. The Council meets at a sombre moment for the Namibian people. For years now they have seen their hopes raised, only to be dashed to the ground time and again. They have heard of near breakthroughs, effusively described, but which came to naught; they have heard of hushed airborne diplomatic forays in the African night skies, but which led to nowhere. They have seen their leaders and allies pressured to make concessions and compromises in the so-called proximity talks, pre-implementation talks, shuttle consultations, talks about talks, but these have turned out to be talks about nothing; they have also heard about détente, constructive engagement, linkages and parallelisms, but all this plethora of diplomatic mumbo-jumbo and geometry has yielded nothing. They are still an oppressed and brutalized nation. Namibia is still an occupied territory.

32. It is now nearly 70 years since Namibia was taken over in 1915 from Germany by South Africa, on behalf of the British Empire; and it is 25 years since the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was adopted. All the former German colonies are now free and independent. Yet the people of Namibia have remained under the yoke of colonialism and racist oppression.

33. I recall these events in order to underline the moral and legal obligation of the world community, and in particular that of some of the Powers allied during the First World War, to the Namibian people. There are members in this Council who by their actions and inactions, both present and past, bear a heavy moral responsibility for the tragedy that is Namibia. As so many other speakers have underlined, the Mandate given to South Africa by the League of Nations to hold the Territory of Namibia in "trust" on behalf of mankind was subsequently revoked by the General Assembly in resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, by the Security Council in numerous resolutions—in particular resolution 269 (1969)—and by the International Court of Justice in its advisory opinion handed down on 21 June 1971.[2]

34. The presence of Pretoria in Namibia is therefore devoid of both legal and moral validity. It is based on the power of a bandit holding hostages. Hence it is in the light of these facts that we should judge the installation of a so-called interim administration in Namibia. This administration is a creature of illegitimate parentage and by definition is itself illegitimate. From illegality only the illegal can result. The Council in its resolution 439 (1978), *inter alia*, reiterated the view that any transfer of power, in contravention of the United Nations resolutions, including resolution 439 (1978) is null and void. It was therefore only appropriate that the Council, in a note by the President of 3 May 1985 [*S/17151*], rejected the so-called interim administration as null and void. In the same spirit, the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries, at its Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting on the question of Namibia, held at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April 1985, condemned and rejected Pretoria's recent manoeuvre as being fraudulent and without validity in law whatsoever [*see S/17184 and Corr.1, annex*]. We hope therefore that on this point there will be no equivocation by any member of the Council.

35. The events taking place in Windhoek today are a desperate and futile attempt to hijack the Namibian independence plan. The Council must unreservedly condemn this strategem by the racist Pretoria régime.

36. South Africa's conduct in the Namibia independence negotiations has lacked candour and integrity. It is a story of duplicity, deviousness, insincerity, arrogance, obstinacy and obstructionism. Its behaviour in the negotiations leading to Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and since then is a vivid demonstration of this. During the so-called proximity talks or "shuttle consultations", held in New York in 1978, South Africa stormed out of the negotiations claiming that the gap was too wide to justify further talks. It then went on to enact the notorious Proclamation A.G. 26 of 1978, under which it incarcerated hundreds of leaders of SWAPO. From there it proceeded to send its troops into Angola, where they massacred hundreds of unarmed Namibian refugees in the camp at Cuamato. It resorted to all those machinations in a desperate attempt to sabotage the negotiations.

37. But SWAPO remained resolute and steadfast in the face of all that calculated provocation. Methodically it dismantled all South Africa's objections until Pretoria could find no more ground on which to deny Namibia its independence. Consequently, South Africa was forced to accept the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence embodied in resolution 435 (1978). But no sooner had it accepted that resolution than it proceeded to undermine it by conducting

its unilateral and sham "elections" in Namibia in 1978. Then the wriggling, twisting and turning started again, until by 1980 the international community thought it had virtually struck a deal with the *apartheid* régime for it to get out of Namibia. Thus the United Nations called for a pre-implementation conference at Geneva in 1981 to go over the details of the modalities and instrumentalities of the Namibia independence plan as embodied in resolution 435 (1978).

38. Alas, it soon became clear that South Africa's intransigence had found encouragement from some quarters in Washington during the 1980 American presidential elections. The result was that the Geneva meeting became a charade, a mere farce, with South Africa giving the alleged partiality of the United Nations as its nebulous reason for walking out.

39. Sadly, it also became clear that Pretoria's reading of the signals from Washington were well founded. For, when the new Administration articulated its policy on southern Africa, it introduced its apologia for *apartheid*, known today as the policy of "constructive engagement". This strategy, we were given to understand, was meant to bring about peace and understanding among the nations of southern Africa, as well as Namibian independence. In the name of "constructive engagement", the new Administration radically changed what we had come to believe to be the position of every United States Government, that is, to tell publicly to South Africa that its *apartheid* system and aggressive disposition towards its neighbours were the root causes of violence in the region.

40. Instead, by what can only be described as a perverse twist of moral philosophy, "constructive engagement", for the first time, equated the brutal violence of an oppressive system that the international community had declared to be a crime against humanity, with the force used by its victims to resist it. How can we, in the name of humanity, equate the violence of the Gestapo and SS murder squads with the resistance of the victims of the holocaust? It is a horrible perversion of logic to describe South Africa's aggression against its neighbours as justified "protective action". Since when can the protection of an institutionalized crime against humanity be regarded as justified? It is immoral to lecture and pressure the front-line States and SWAPO into acquiescing in the existence of the evil system of *apartheid* in Namibia and South Africa. Short of its verbal trappings and mental gymnastics, that is what "constructive engagement" amounts to. It has no moral basis, and it has yielded no positive results.

41. We speak strongly against this policy, because we believe that it was its inception that introduced the tragic concept of "linkage" to the Namibian independence issue. To South Africa, the linkage of Namibian independence to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola was an unexpected opportunity to transform its colonial racist occupation of Namibia into a global ideological crusade—the defence of the so-called Western Christian civilization against imaginary Russians in southern Africa. Here, a simple matter of decolonization and racial oppression was elevated and given a global dimension. South Africa now hides its colonial racist objectives behind American global concerns. It is as if the United States has now become a toll used by South Africa to promote its racist policies. The springbok has charmed the American eagle into its racist snare. And we see the eagle's wings hopelessly entrapped as it tries to give the impression that great changes are taking place in South Africa as a result of its policies. Every twist and turn by the *apartheid* régime is presented with great fanfare by transatlantic satellite communications.

42. In this propaganda battle, logic has been turned on its head. The creation of three parliaments where there used to be one is presented as a "new dispensation" meant to unite the people of South Africa. The fact that this is consistent with *apartheid*—the doctrine of separation—is conveniently forgotten. Its divisive strategy of trying to incorporate the Indian and Coloured communities to reinforce the *apartheid* edifice dominated by an Afrikaner minority is brushed aside. Since when is the reinforcement of the instrumentalities of oppression to be regarded as a positive reform?

43. The other day we were told in this chamber that great strides were being made because South Africans were now free to marry whom they wished. But where will these multiracial couples live? The Group Areas Act forbids the husband to live in the same area as his wife—and, of course, the children cannot live with either of the parents. This is an absurdity. How can anybody be hoodwinked by such gimmicks? *Apartheid* is about sharing power between the 80 per cent black majority and the white minority. It is not, I submit, about who goes to bed with whom. It is really an insult to our intelligence to present the removal of the so-called petty *apartheid* as if it were the fundamental question in South Africa. It is definitely not.

44. The present American Administration is wrong if it believes that the *apartheid* edifice is crumbling and that President Botha is somehow the South African equivalent of a twentieth-century Abraham Lincoln who needs our support and understanding. He is not; and trying to give him an aura of international respectability by wining and dining him in the capitals of Western Europe is a tragic error of judgement.

45. The aforementioned interpretation of the policy of "constructive engagement" is the most generous that one can give it. The alternative to this pathetic imagery of an immobilized giant reduced to sycophancy by a crafty racist régime is that of collusion between South Africa and the United States Administration. Recent events in southern Angola, where we saw a Mr. Lehrman and his motley band of rebels plotting subversion and treason against Angola and other States in southern Africa, make us stop and think again about United States policy towards our region. We understand that this Mr. Lehrman carried a message of encouragement from none other than President Reagan to Jonas Savimbi, the leader of the South African-sponsored bandits in Angola and his confederates.

46. The role of the United States as a would-be honest broker on the Namibian question is now most problematic.

It seems the United States has now become part of the problem. Certainly the South African Prime Minister came very close to letting the cat out of the bag when speaking in the South African Parliament on 18 April this year. He is reported, *inter alia*, to have said:

> "However, as I told Parliament on 27 April 1984, the people of South West Africa/Namibia, including SWAPO, cannot wait indefinitely for a breakthrough on the withdrawal of the Cubans from Angola. Should it eventually become evident, after all avenues have been thoroughly explored, that there is no realistic prospect of attaining this goal, all the parties most intimately affected by the present negotiations will obviously have to reconsider how internationally acceptable independence may best be attained in the light of prevailing circumstances." [*See 17/52, appendix 2.*]

47. Put most simply, the issue of the Cuban presence in Angola is an American concern, which South Africa is using for convenience for the time being. If it can create an amenable régime in Namibia it intends to leave the linkage baby with its American parents. That that is so is evidenced by the fact that when Angola made some important concessions on the subject last year, South Africa spurned them for it was not sure of the emergence of a puppet régime in Namibia.

48. For all those reasons it has now become imperative that we officially and symbolically bring the Namibian independence negotiation process back to where it belongs—the United Nations. It is only the Secretary-General who now has both the legal and moral authority to mediate. Others have undermined their credibility as mediators by attempting to bring extraneous issues into the negotiation process. They have become part of the obstacles to be removed.

49. Finally, my delegation wishes to place on record its admiration for, and appreciation of, the tremendous efforts the Secretary-General has made to try to resolve the Namibia problem and appeals to all members of the Council to rally behind him as he reasserts the authority of the United Nations on the Namibia issue. He needs the full support of the Council.

50. Let the Council send a clear, unambiguous message to the Pretoria racists that the game is up. If they do not comply now, the Council should show that it has the determination and political will to act, and act decisively. Let the Council give a lead to the world by warning South Africa that it is prepared to impose and implement mandatory sanctions if no progress is made on this issue. For outside this chamber there are ordinary men and women from all walks of life, as well as legislators and Governments, already grappling with these issues. They are desperately trying to send urgent and strong messages to the South African régime by their campaigns of disinvestment and other sanctions. The Council should not fail those men and women of good will, and should not betray the people of Namibia. It should not be a Council of cynicism and despair; it should be a Council of hope. The time to act is now. Tomorrow may be too late.

51. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Czechoslovakia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

52. Mr. CÉSAR (Czechoslovakia): Mr. President, I should like to thank you and all the members of the Council for having given me this opportunity to address the Council during its deliberations on the very serious issue on the current agenda. I also wish to congratulate you sincerely, on your assumption of the presidency for this month and to express my conviction that your distinguished personal qualities, diplomatic skills and experience are a guarantee of the successful fulfilment of the Council's mandate. Your country, Trinidad and Tobago, has for many years been an active member of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, organs which are obliged to include among their priorities consideration of the pernicious consequences of the racist and colonial policies of the Government of South Africa.

53. I should also like to express our appreciation of the performance of the representative of Thailand in the office of President of the Council in May.

54. The question of Namibia has for long years been raising ever-growing concerns. The Council is compelled to deal with this problem, the essence of which is connected with attempts to perpetuate persisting colonialism, the enforcement of neo-colonial diktat, flagrant violations of the norms of international law, disregard of the conclusions of the United Nations and of the will of world public opinion, escalation of tension and the endangering of peace in southern Africa. The Pretoria régime prolongs the illegal occupation of Namibia, trampling underfoot the inalienable right of the Namibians to self-determination and independence, militarizing Namibia and escalating military, police and judicial repression and terror, carrying out consistent exploitation of the natural, mineral and human resources of Namibia, transferring to Namibia the inhuman practices of *apartheid* and launching from Namibian territory acts of aggression, subversion and destabilization against independent African States.

55. It is imperialism, with its attempts to prevent the consistent elimination of all remnants of colonialism and racism in the region, that has caused the present situation in Namibia and in the whole of southern Africa. It is in accordance with the strategic interests and intentions of imperialism that Pretoria has been blocking the efforts of the international community to solve the Namibian question and obstructing the implementation of the series of resolutions on that question adopted by the Council. In the interests of United States strategy in the south of Africa, it has raised the totally unjustified demand to link Namibia's independence to the departure of internationalist Cuban troops from Angola, where those troops assist, upon the request of the legitimate Government of the People's Republic of Angola, in combating the acts of aggression and subversion perpetrated by the South African régime.

56. Time and again Pretoria has launched new attempts designed to perpetuate its domination in Namibia. The latest—the unilateral plan for a so-called internal settlement—has rightly been rejected by the whole international community. This action, null and void since its very inception, constitutes nothing but an attempt to bantustanize Namibia.

57. The seriousness of the situation in Namibia and the necessity of a resolute and speedy solution were convincingly explained at the beginning of the current discussion by Mr. Nujoma, President of SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people. He also pointed out the obstacles preventing the immediate implementation of self-determination for the Namibian people and fulfilment of the United Nations plan. They include primarily the many-sided support granted to the Pretoria régime by certain Western States and Israel. This support is motivated by the ideological, global, strategic as well as economic interests of imperialism and provided mainly in the spirit of the discredited policy of so-called constructive engagement.

58. The ways towards termination of the suffering of the Namibian people are set forth very clearly in the series of conclusions of our Organization embodied primarily in Council resolution 385 (1976), 435 (1978) and 539 (1983). At the time of our Organization's fortieth jubilee, when we are reviewing the contributions of the United Nations to the solution of the world's problems and the role of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted 25 years ago, the imperative to put those conclusions into practice acquires ever stronger topicality and urgency. The legacy of the victory over fascism and nazism in the Second World War undoubtedly commits all of us to seeking speedy ways of preventing further crimes against the Namibians and immediately ensuring Namibia's independence.

59. The Government and people of Czechoslovakia resolutely condemn the continuing illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of South Africa and demand that the Namibian people immediately be granted independence and that the territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands, be maintained. We stand for immediate implementation of the decisions of the United Nations on this question. We reject any attempts to link the question of Namibia's decolonization with any issues irrelevant to it or with any other demands. We oppose all of Pretoria's attempts at a so-called internal settlement of the Namibian problem on neo-colonialist terms outside the framework of the United Nations and without the participation of SWAPO.

60. As was noted during the visit to Prague last March of a SWAPO delegation headed by the Secretary-General of that Organization, Mr. Toïvo Ya Toïvo, the Czechoslovak Government and people are in full solidarity with the struggle for freedom and independence being waged by the Namibian people under the leadership of their sole authentic representative, SWAPO. Czechoslovakia is ready to continue granting that struggle its determined and all-round support. We unequivocally advocate the adoption without delay of effective measures, including sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, that would make the Pretoria régime terminate its illegal occupation of Namibia, liquidate the inhuman system of *apartheid* and stop subversive activities in the south of the African continent. We are convinced that the present deliberations of the Council should lead to the adoption of effective measures to that end.

61. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Guyana. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

62. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): The Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country, Mr. Rashleigh Jackson, sends his deepest regrets to his colleagues, within the Non-Aligned Movement and outside it, for his inability to be present in New York for this series of meetings.

63. My second duty is to thank you, Mr. President, and all the members of the Council for having acceded to our request to participate in the debate.

64. At no other time in the history of the question of Namibia has the Organization's resolve to defend the rights and interests of the Namibian people been so sorely tested as it is being tested now. For, as the Secretary-General has pointed out in his report of 6 June [*S/17242*], the prevailing difficulties with regard to this question have been compounded and given a new dimension by the recent decision of South Africa to install a puppet administration in Namibia.

65. Our delegation is participating at a very late stage of what has been a lengthy debate. This debate has served, among other things, to underscore and to strengthen the almost universal consensus that already exists about Namibia's freedom. It is a consensus that is well founded.

66. In 1966 the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory and made the United Nations responsible for the future of the Territory. In 1971 the International Court of Justice, in an advisory opinion,[1] stated that the Assembly had acted correctly, that South Africa's continued presence in Namibia was illegal, that States were under an obligation to recognize that illegality and to refrain from any acts which might appear to imply a recognition of that illegal presence. In that same year the Council adopted resolution 301 (1971), in which it endorsed the Court's advisory opinion.

67. My delegation does not recall an issue on the international agenda in respect of which three organs of the United Nations, each acting independently of the others, have spoken in such unison and clarity and forcefulness. This is surely one aspect of the uniqueness of Namibia. But it is not in this fact, which is of profound importance in its own way, that the consensus on Namibia is rooted. That consensus is rooted in the fact that, under contemporary international law, colonialism constitutes a denial of basic human rights and essential political freedoms, colonial occupation is illegal, and people subjected to alien domination and exploita-

tion have the right of self-determination, a right which predates even the creation of the Organization.

68. While condemning and rejecting South Africa's creation of a so-called interim government in Namibia, speakers in the current debate have also reaffirmed the centrality of resolution 435 (1978) and the need for its immediate implementation. In addition, they have highlighted the international community's stern rejection of linkage of Namibia's independence with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. The people of Namibia must be free because it is their right to be free. Exercise of that right cannot be circumscribed or made conditional. As President Nyerere of Tanzania has argued, it is only by accident that Angola is a neighbour of Namibia. What is the difference between an insistence on Cuban withdrawal from Angola and an insistence that Namibia will not be free until Soviet troops are withdrawn from Afghanistan, or, for example, until Vietnamese troops are withdrawn from Kampuchea? This conditioning of Namibia's freedom upon the solution of problems elsewhere is not only irrelevant; it is simply immoral.

69. The debate in the Council has also served further to isolate the rulers in Pretoria as the party responsible for Namibia's continued domination. There is universal rejection of the policies of *apartheid* and aggression practised by the Pretoria régime, and that régime is identified as the one whose actions pose the gravest threat to peace and security in southern Africa.

70. As if this needed further confirmation, the Pretoria régime last week launched a brutal attack on Botswana, in violation of that territory's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. This attack took place even while the Council was considering the question of Namibia.

71. The President of Guyana, Mr. Linden Forbes Sampson Burnham, in a message to the President of Botswana, Mr. Quett K. J. Masire, stated:

> "The Government and people of Guyana are shocked at the brutal invasion by the armed forces of South Africa of the independent and peace-loving nation of Botswana and by the cold-blooded murder of innocent people in its capital, Gaborone.
>
> "Guyana condemns in the strongest possible terms this latest in the long list of callous acts of aggression by South Africa against neighbouring African States . . .
>
> "The Government and people of Guyana call upon all peace-loving and progressive forces to join together in renewed efforts to isolate South Africa in all fields and to bring about the dismantling of the odious system of *apartheid*.
>
> "Similarly we urge upon those who continue to give succour to the *apartheid* régime to review and alter their relations with Pretoria."

72. The Guyana delegation has seen the draft resolution [*S/17284*] which is being considered for adoption by the Council, and has studied it carefully. We consider that if this draft were to be adopted in its present form the Council would be showing consistency. As long ago as 1969 [*resolution 269 (1969)*], the Council had decided that in the event of failure by South Africa to co-operate in implementation of its resolutions, it would meet immediately to determine upon necessary steps in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. That was 16 years ago. The Council has never gone beyond that pronouncement where the relations of South Africa with Namibia are concerned. Since then what the Council has been doing is temporizing where South Africa is concerned—acting evasively in order to gain time, postponing the real decision, seeking what options might exist short of taking the action that has the support of the overwhelming majority in the international community. Once again, in 1985, the Council seems poised to decide to meet again to decide on what to do about South Africa's non-co-operation.

73. This attitude on the part of the Council has contributed in no small measure to bolstering and giving a sense of protection to the Pretoria régime. The body responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security is, by its inaction, indirectly giving comfort to the régime that poses such a grave threat to peace and security in southern Africa.

74. In the course of the debate, the Council has been the object of much forthright comment by several delegations, including my own. The Council, after all, is a very exposed and prominent body. What is more, it has clear obligations in respect of the maintenance of international peace and security, and Member States look to it to respond credibly to situations where peace and security are imperiled, and more so where its own authority is being flouted. But as we review the Council's performance in respect of Namibia, it is important and only fair that we maintain proper perspective and not see the Security Council as an undifferentiated whole. I venture to say that in any one year there is an overwhelming majority of the membership of the Council fully supportive of firm concrete action against South Africa. But we realize that the pace of the Council is always determined by the slowest and most conservative mover. That is the way in which this Council's procedures are fashioned. In the case of Namibia, the pace of the Council will be determined by that permanent member which least wishes to see a change in the *status quo*.

75. Let me say this in another way. Geisa Rocha, who used to be in the secretariat of the United Nations Council for Namibia, has written in her book, *In Search of Namibian Independence*, the following:

> "It is not particularly fruitful to urge certain courses of action on an international organization or to condemn such a body for inaction or ineffectiveness if the bases of support necessary for its involvement and success do not exist. An intelligent approach to international conflict management . . . must be predicated on an understanding of the constraints imposed on international organizations by the interests and policies of those groupings of States in whose hands the destinies of these bodies rest."

Mrs. Rocha then quotes from Inis Claude, who wrote:

"[The United Nations] is above all a tool, and, like other tools, it has possibilities and limitations . . . The essential questions are: who has the handle in his grasp and what are the purposes in his mind?"

She then offers her own conclusion:

"It is my view that the predominant problem facing the international community is not how to bring about change in the attitude of the South African Government, but how to secure such changes in the policies of South Africa's major Western allies who have the handle in their grasp . . ."

76. That seems to be the real problem. It is inconceivable that an Organization of one hundred and fifty-nine independent States has to be impassive and helpless in the face of the contempt and arrogance of one. That is not the letter, nor is it the spirit of the Charter. South Africa's attitude is not the fundamental problem. If the racial configuration in South Africa as between oppressors and oppressed were the reverse of what it is now, we might already have seen that the attitude of the rulers is not the problem. The problem is that South Africa's contempt and arrogance are being tolerated by some of those who have the handles in their grasp. It is not that they do not have options. They do have options; but they have chosen to soft-pedal on South Africa.

77. Now, having established that, what does one do? Do we sit supinely back and wait for those who hold the handles to undergo change? We should not, nor can we. The Government of Guyana, for its part, will continue espousing the cause of the freedom fighters in southern Africa. We shall continue to be insistent in international forums on their behalf. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country, Mr. Rashleigh Jackson, declared in Georgetown on 25 May last, on the occasion of the celebration of African Liberation Day:

"For us in Guyana, the blood of the freedom fighters of Africa and Asia flows in our veins. Commencing last year and continuing for four years, we are celebrating a more than century-long existence of this connection. Their struggles have been ours and ours theirs; and in the councils of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and elsewhere, we seek common cause against colonialism, imperialism, racism and alien domination. The commitment to the struggle of those who are not yet free in Africa is thus a shared one. The People's National Congress and the Government and people of Guyana therefore have an attachment to the liberation movements which is umbilical, one which is reinforced by history and culture . . .".

78. The denial of self-determination and freedom in southern Africa is causing extensive suffering and loss of life in that region. It threatens peace and security, not only in the southern Africa region but beyond it. Those who now shield South Africa should certainly see a need to compel the Pretoria régime to dismantle its racial policies and to co-operate in Namibia's liberation so as to avoid a situation which in the long run could damage their own interests over a much wider area.

79. The situation in southern Africa will evolve its own dynamic. There are forces unleashed inside South Africa which will themselves determine in large measure the pace of change. As the late Steve Biko said:

"The winds of liberation which have been sweeping the face of Africa have reached our very borders. There is no more doubt about the inevitability of change—the only questions now remaining are 'how' and 'when'."

I go even further than Steve Biko. Those winds are now blowing already inside South Africa. Their fury will not diminish; it will grow in intensity. We are already witnessing the phenomenon and we are also seeing the results it is yielding.

80. The cost of freedom in South Africa and in Namibia will therefore be high indeed in terms of human life and human suffering. But there is still room for an intervention by the Council to reduce that cost by bringing about a peaceful solution in Namibia. The outcome is not in doubt nor can it be prevented. My delegation hopes that some of us do not lose the privilege of sharing in bringing it about.

81. After the conclusion of this debate our Secretary-General must resume his mission of contact with South Africa. That mission, difficult enough, has been made even more so by South Africa's recent actions, which reveal the absolute contempt in which the Pretoria régime holds the Organization. Guyana applauds his patience and his fortitude. He has our fullest confidence, and we pledge to him our continuing support.

82. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Yugoslavia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

83. Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia): It is reassuring to see you, Sir, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Trinidad and Tobago, a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, presiding over this series of important Council meetings. Your commitment to the cause of peace, independence and sovereignty of peoples and countries will no doubt contribute to the successful consideration of the question of Namibia. During the preparations for these meetings Mr. Alleyne, representative of Trinidad and Tobago, has amply demonstrated his dedication to the lofty ideals of the Charter of the United Nations and to the principles of the policy of non-alignment.

84. The Minister for Foreign Affairs and the representative of Thailand have shown competence and wisdom in guiding the deliberations of the Council in the month of May.

85. Gravely concerned over the impediments that South Africa, abetted by its allies, had defiantly strewn in the path towards genuine independence for Namibia, the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, held in April at New Delhi, requested the convocation of this series of meetings of the Council [*S/17184 and Corr.1, annex,*

para. 48]. The Ministers were guided by their solidarity with the struggle of the people of Namibia for their independence and against colonial occupation, a struggle Namibians have been waging for generations.

86. The Co-ordinating Bureau invited the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of a number of non-aligned countries to participate personally in this series of meetings. However, the Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Mr. Raif Dizdarević, could not personally participate owing to previous and urgent engagements. He authorized me to speak on his behalf and upon his instructions.

87. South Africa shies from nothing to deny the people of Namibia their inalienable rights to freedom, independence and self-determination. It continues colonial occupation, terror and exploitation, causing great human suffering. It pursues the policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination, flagrantly violating the human rights of the people of Namibia. Under pressures and threats, Namibians are forced to seek refuge in the neighbouring countries. Pretoria is conscripting Namibians in the occupying army, thus setting the stage for fratricidal war. It is recruiting mercenaries and piling up military effectives. It is using the Territory of Namibia as the springboard for aggression and subversion against independent African countries, Angola in particular.

88. The *apartheid* régime is a permanent threat to the security, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the front-line States. The latest criminal foray into independent Botswana should be met with immediate condemnation and adequate measures.

89. The human and natural resources of Namibia are being plundered by South Africa and others in defiance of the decisions of the United Nations and of Decree No. 1[3] of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

90. No attempts to quell the liberation struggle of the people of Namibia are nor will be successful. People ready to fight for self-determination and independence are invincible, and their resolve attracts an ever-growing international support. This explains the international recognition earned by the struggle of Namibia and SWAPO. It is a source of pride for us to see the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, and his high-level delegation participating in the deliberations of the Council. Their struggle is central to the present and to the future of Namibia. Perseverance in and intensification of that struggle is, for the people of Namibia and for SWAPO, the only way to respond to the duplicity of South Africa and to its refusal to participate in a political settlement. Our support of that struggle is an obligation. Yugoslavia will continue to spare no effort in its support for and assistance to the people of Namibia and their sole, authentic representative, SWAPO.

91. Foreign domination in Namibia, and anywhere else in the world, poses a direct threat to international peace and security. The longer the occupation lasts, the greater the danger of drawing the issue of Namibia into bloc rivalry. The issue of Namibia is not an East-West issue. It is a matter of self-determination and independence, and let us perceive it that way.

92. The United Nations plan for Namibia is one of the remarkable achievements of the world Organization in the last decade. It ought to be defended vigorously and effectively, and it must be implemented without delay, without changes and without preconditions. The United Nations plan is a result not only of debate, but of negotiation; it is not meant to control the crisis, but to do away with it. It rests on the principles of self-determination, independence and sovereignty of peoples and countries. It is the only basis for a peaceful solution. However, its implementation is being prevented by South Africa through ever-more numerous stratagems and ploys. Irrelevant and extraneous issues, such as linkage, are being raised and rejected and condemned by the international community. So-called internal settlements are being devised based on puppet political institutions, the latest being artificially brought to life these days. It will, no doubt, meet with rejection by the international community, and rightly so.

93. All this amounts to nothing but a series of attempts by South Africa to buy time, to ride on the backs of the people of Namibia, to occupy a part of Angola and to continue to try to intimidate the front-line States.

94. A lot has been said, but not nearly enough by far has been done to implement the United Nations plan. For seven years, South Africa has been trying to shunt it aside, to push it into oblivion, and to bury it under the growing pile of prevarication, manipulation and hypocrisy. It is for the Council to cut short this seemingly endless exercise of evasion, defiance of the will of the United Nations and disregard for the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

95. We feel that it is for the Security Council to act promptly and with the necessary vigour to bring about the implementation of the United Nations plan. It should not confine itself to condemnations and appeals. It should rather adopt an action-oriented decision that would amount to renewed and strengthened pressure on South Africa. The Security Council should set a time-frame for the implementation of the plan, and should then monitor the implementation of its decisions and intervene promptly to that end.

96. If South Africa continues in its intransigence, there is no option but the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. Furthermore, the Governments of all Member States should take appropriate legislative, administrative and other measures, pending the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa, in other to isolate that country in the political, economic, military and cultural fields and in the field of sports. The Secretary-General should be given support in continuing to play an important role in the implementation of the United Nations plan.

97. In the present circumstances, the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia have gained in impor-

tance. It is necessary to support the implementation of that Council's mandate.

98. The United Nations and the entire international community should do their best to bring independence and freedom to Namibia. That would contribute to the relaxation of tensions and to stability in international relations. At a time when belief in the United Nations is dwindling in some quarters, this would show once again that the United Nations is an indispensable forum for the solution of international issues.

99. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Hungary. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

100. Mr. FOLDEAK (Hungary): Allow me at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency at a time when the United Nations is required to take crucial decisions. I am confident that your personal qualities and diplomatic skill will contribute to the successful outcome of the debate on the important issue before the Council.

101. I should like also to express our appreciation to your predecessor, the representative of Thailand, for the successful manner in which he conducted the affairs of the Council during the month of May.

102. Let me express the gratitude of my delegation to the members of the Council for having given me the opportunity to participate in this debate.

103. My delegation has been following carefully the events in South Africa during the past months. Since the introduction of the so-called constitutional reforms last September, the tension in that country has been increasing constantly. The oppressive apparatus of the racist State is becoming more and more aggressive and violent against the majority of the population of the country. The result is more killings, more victims and more tension. It is no exaggeration to say that the racist State is at war with its own population. That situation was discussed in the Council not long ago.

104. This time the Council is dealing with another aspect of the behaviour of the racist régime of South Africa: the obstruction of Council resolutions, which are binding on Member States. The latest manoeuvres by Pretoria to introduce an interim administration in Namibia, however, go beyond simple obstruction: they constitute a serious violation of Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978). South Africa has no right to take any unilateral measures in Namibia outside the scope of the relevant United Nations resolutions. My delegation absolutely condemns the establishment of an interim government in Namibia with the involvement of the so-called Multi-Party Conference, which is a puppet of Pretoria and represents no one.

105. My delegation has studied carefully the report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) on the question of Namibia [*S/17242*] in which the Secretary-General states that in spite of resolution 539 (1983), which rejected the linkage issue, South Africa still insists that the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola is a precondition for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Because of that intransigent position, the United Nations plan has remained unimplemented.

106. In paragraph 8 of its resolution 539 (1983), the Council called upon South Africa

> "to communicate to [the Secretary-General] its choice of the electoral system in order to facilitate the immediate and unconditional implementation of the United Nations plan embodied in Security Council resolution 435 (1978)".

South Africa has ignored this call as well.

107. During the past two decades, the rulers of Pretoria have furnished ample evidence that they cannot be considered reliable partners in any negotiating process. Their obsession with *apartheid* prevents them from accepting the logic of fairness, decency and justice. They will not change as long as they feel the presence of the protective shield of veto in this Council.

108. My delegation believes the time has come when Pretoria must be faced with decisive, united action by the Council. It is time to use the power of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations if South Africa does not comply with resolutions and continues to obstruct the implementation of the United Nations plan.

109. Namibia must be free without further delay. The independence of the last major colonial Territory involves the most fundamental principles on which the United Nations is based and which must be respected by all of its Member States.

110. It is the firm conviction of my delegation, and of the vast majority of delegations that have spoken before the Council, that the Pretoria régime could not defy the resolutions of the United Nations and the will of the international community without the support of its allies, first and foremost the United States. The policy of so-called constructive engagement has led to disastrous consequences in terms of a general worsening of the situation in the southern Africa region, in terms of the loss of more human lives and in terms of more reckless disregard of United Nations resolutions by the racist régime of South Africa.

111. The latest example of the aggressive policy of South Africa is the armed incursion into Botswana, a peaceful neighbouring country. This armed aggression cannot be justified. It is a serious violation of the sovereignty of an independent State. My delegation strongly condemns this brutal act of aggression.

112. We firmly believe that Pretoria must not be given any more support from any quarter. This time South Africa

must be confronted with decisive and unified action by the Security Council. There should not be any encouraging signals for Pretoria, for that would only further delay the implementation of the United Nations plan.

113. With the exception of South Africa, all parties concerned have demonstrated flexibility and readiness to implement resolution 435 (1978), the only acceptable basis for the settlement of the question of Namibia. The Government of Angola and the leadership of SWAPO have participated in the negotiating process with good faith and a genuine desire to solve the problem. My delegation expresses appreciation for their constructive approach.

114. I also take this opportunity to assure the people of Namibia and its sole, legitimate representative, SWAPO, of the support and solidarity of the people and the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic. My country will, as in the past, continue to render all kinds of support for its just struggle for independence.

115. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Congo. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

116. Mr. GAYAMA (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, since I am speaking at this late stage in the work of the Security Council, the Congolese delegation is happy to express to you, quite advisedly, congratulations and sincere admiration for the way in which you have been conducting the deliberations of this important United Nations body. I am pleased that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of a fraternal country friendly to the African continent, Trinidad and Tobago, has assumed the role of President of the Council at a time when the Council is dealing with the question of Namibia. This is a question that is as dear to you as it is to us, and we know that you will take the opportunity to bring to bear your well-known experience and talent to ensure the successful outcome of these deliberations.

117. I wish also to pay a tribute to your predecessors, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the representative of Thailand, who guided the work of the Council with great talent last month, thereby contributing to the universal respect this body commands.

118. The efforts made by the Secretary-General since the beginning of his mandate to try to resolve the Namibian crisis are familiar to us all. We should like to thank him and to encourage him to continue his work to make it possible one day—as soon as possible—to celebrate Namibia's accession to international sovereignty. The current meetings should be a decisive landmark in that regard.

119. On the subject of decisive landmarks in the history of Namibia, there is a very compelling one whose significance for the history of Namibia speaks for itself—is the commemoration this year of the one-hundredth anniversary of the Act adopted in 1885 at the Berlin Conference, whereby Africa was carved up and subjugated, thus institutionalizing within the context of "might is right" a process that began in the sixteenth century with the systematic plunder of the human and material resources of the continent, the consequences of which are still felt to this day.

120. A few months ago the People's Republic of the Congo hosted an International Seminar on the Berlin Conference, thus stressing how the lessons learned from this commemoration could shed light on the present situation.

121. My delegation is laying stress on this one-hundredth anniversary because of its direct bearing on what was then called South West Africa. It was in the capial of imperial Germany that the fate of the Territory was sealed, and the colonial method chosen for Namibia was one of the most barbaric conceivable. It involved quite simply the genocide of indigenous peoples—the Hereros and the Ovambos, in particular. Tens of thousands of people were massacred in a very short period of time before the First World War, simply to create space for the occupiers and to exploit the grazing, mining and other resources of the country. Whereas elsewhere the end of the war brought with it a taste of freedom for the stricken peoples, the same could not be said for the people of Namibia, which went from Scylla to Charybdis—from the bloody hands of an imperial European Power into the hands of a gang of bigots then installed in South Africa and determined to assert their principal virtues, scorn and cruelty. The rest is history. Despite the celebration this year of the fortieth anniversary of the signing of the Charter of the United Nations, which marked for the world the advent of a new international order, and despite the 25 years that have elapsed since the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Namibian people is still languishing in the dark ages of the old order. Like the neighbouring South African people living under the régime of *apartheid*, it suffered the application of Nazi principles and the Nazi order that had prevailed during the Second Word War and, as is well known, were condemned at the Nuremberg trials.

122. The anachronism, the violation of the norms and principles of international law, and the non-implementation of the relevant General Assembly and Security Council decisions are today the features and the symbols of a situation purposely maintained by South Africa.

123. After 100 years of colonization, we are still haggling over the accession of a people to self-determination and independence. The fact that the question of Namibia has been on the General Assembly's agenda since the founding of the United Nations has apparently had no decisive effect on finding a solution to the problem. The fortieth anniversary of the adoption of the Charter of the United Nations should remind all Member States of the need to return to the Organization its original spirit, so that it can once again serve "We the peoples of the United Nations", as mentioned in the preamble of the Charter, instead of following the present course characterized by the selfish interests of a few.

124. Indeed, in legal terms the United Nations could do no less than what it did when it terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and designated the United Nations

Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority of the Territory and, more particularly, when it adopted the settlement plan for Namibia contained in resolution 435 (1978).

125. The only thing missing here is action. In this regard, the obstacles have been fully identified. South Africa is undoubtedly the main obstacle; but Pretoria is not alone. Its support for the implementation of the settlement plan was shelved the day when the Western Powers—from which it gains most of its support—had imposed on them by one member a strange linkage between the implementation of the settlement plan and the domestic situation in Angola, a sovereign country of the United Nations.

126. However, at the present stage of the question's consideration, the United Nations can do nothing but ensure the implementation of its plan. It would be a shameful affront to the memory of so many Namibian martyrs, including women and children of Kassinga, to impose more on that people which has made all possible concessions through SWAPO, its sole, authentic representative, on the strength of the contact group's commitment to promote a peaceful solution of the problem.

127. The legitimacy of the aspirations and the magnitude of the sacrifice endured by the Namibian people should be reflected, we feel, in a genuine return to the spirit and the letter of resolution 435 (1978). We therefore appeal to those States which have acknowledged that they have some influence on the Pretoria Government not to give it too easy alibis to behave as it wishes outside the international consensus. We also express our gratitude to the members of the Western contact group—to the extent that that group still exists—which, to be honest, have dissociated themselves from the manoeuvres that could have taken them too far in an unworthy compromise with the South African régime.

128. The acts of piracy of which South Africa was recently guilty in the north of Angola, in Cabinda, reveal the arrogant scorn shown by the *apartheid* régime for international opinion while it relies on the benevolent understanding of some who consider those acts to be nothing more than pursuit of its enemies. For the needs of the cause, South Africa and the strategists of East-West confrontation are ready to invent enemies outside instead of determining the true source within the *apartheid* régime itself, which is the permanent threat to international peace and security.

129. All those factors can only further the perpetration of acts of bravado like the decision to impose upon Namibia a so-called internal administration, without any democratic basis or juridical recognition than that of the occupying Power from which it emanates.

130. This situation cannot go on without further endangering an already endangered future, given the accumulation of hard feelings. But, as recognized by the final act of the Seminar of Brazzaville to which I referred before, while the Berlin Conference sowed division and the seeds of desolation, the duty of present generations is to rebuild in unity and understanding something to prevent the maintenance of an unjustified and unjustifiable *status quo*—because it is clear that we can expect no positive, conciliatory gesture from the southern part of the African continent dominated by the *apartheid* régime. International peace and security are directly threatened by the aggressive policies which are acts of defiance by Pretoria against the United Nations and the whole world.

131. The unprovoked attack launched last Friday against Botswana resulting in 11 deaths, many wounded and material damage that has not yet been estimated—this at the very time that the Council was meeting to consider the situation—for which South Africa's responsibility is quite clear, is additional proof of Pretoria's so-called good faith. This act, as everyone knows, is not the first and it will not be the last, particularly if Pretoria thinks it is above any kind of sanctions. Whether it uses clandestine procedures as in the Angolan province of Cabinda or throws off its mask and openly attacks others as it did in Gaborone, South Africa is consistent—that is, it does nothing that promotes peace.

132. The conditions for imposing mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter are there. It only remains now for the Council to draw the necessary conclusions. Not to impose those sanctions in the present circumstances would be to give the *apartheid* régime a kind of hallmark of respectability that would render meaningless the main organ responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security and thus give free rein to disorder and insecurity everywhere in the world.

133. Everyone will therefore understand that we are exhorting the international community to increase manifold assistance to SWAPO so that the Namibian people can wage its struggle until the inevitable victory over colonialism and oppression is won.

134. The Congo has always supported the need to strengthen the Namibian people's ability to wage the struggle through its sole, authentic representative, SWAPO. That was in fact one of the basic recommendations and conclusions of another seminar on the subject, the Seminar on the Intensification of International Action for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, which was also held at Brazzaville last March. "Namibia represents an extreme case of colonialism characterized by brutal oppression, exploitation and denial of basic rights of the Namibian people by the illegal occupation régime of South Africa",[4] was the unequivocal message of the participants in that Seminar.

135. It is clear from these deliberations that there is an overwhelming and constant commitment on the part of the Member States to the ideal of an independent Namibia—an ideal shared by all peoples of the United Nations. It is for us on this fortieth anniversary of the adoption of the Charter to ensure the final universalization of this idea. In so doing we would be fulfilling the expectations of the non-aligned countries, which initiated the convening of this series of meetings following the Extra-

ordinary Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau, held at New Delhi last April. I take this opportunity to address our congratulations to the Ministers for Foreign Affairs, whose participation in the Council's work has conferred upon this body a very special impact.

136. Mr. HUANG Jiahua (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation has already made a statement with regard to the question of Namibia [*2584th meeting*]. We should now like to state our position on South Africa's invasion of Botswana.

137. Just as the Council is debating the issue of Namibia and condemning South Africa for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its incessant subversion of the security of neighbouring countries, the South African authorities have once again launched an invasion into Botswana. That act not only seriously violates the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Botswana, but also constitutes an open challenge to the international community as a whole. The Chinese Government and people express the utmost indignation over, and the strongest condemnation of, South Africa's act of aggression. We also express our deep sympathy for, and solidarity with, the Government and people of Botswana.

138. On 15 June a spokesman of the Chinese Ministry for Foreign Affairs made the following statement about the incident:

> "In the small hours of 14 June South African troops outrageously invaded Gaborone, the capital of Botswana, killing 12 people, wounding many more and destroying some houses and motor vehicles. That was a brazen encroachment upon the sovereignty and territorial integrity of an independent State by the South African authorities and a flagrant provocation against the African countries and peoples. The Chinese Government and people express great indignation over that act and strong condemnation of it.
>
> "The raid upon Botswana by the South African authorities is not an isolated incident: the facts have proved time and again that the root cause of the turbulent and unstable situation in southern Africa lies in the South African authorities' stubborn pursuit of the practice of racism and the policy of destabilizing the neighbouring countries. The South African authorities' perverse acts will only arouse stronger resistance and greater indignation among the African countries and peoples.
>
> "The struggle of Botswana, Angola, Mozambique and the other African front-line States to combat racism, safeguard their sovereignty and territorial integrity and support the Namibian people's fight for independence has won sympathy and support from all the justice-upholding countries and peoples in the world. The Chinese Government and people will, as always, stand firmly by the African countries and peoples and resolutely support their just struggle."

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.

NOTES

[1] A/AC.109/830.

[2] *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports, 1971*, p. 16.

[3] Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974 (*Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth session, Supplement No. 24* (A/35/24), vol. I, annex II).

[4] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fortieth session, Supplement No. 23* (A/40/23), chap. IX, para. 12).

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-61439—April 1994—2,050

UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2594th MEETING: 17 JUNE 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2594)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia:	
(*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);	
(*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);	
(*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2594th MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 17 June 1985, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Errol MAHABIR (Trinidad and Tobago).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2594)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in Namibia:
   (*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);
   (*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);
   (*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)

The meeting was called to order at 4.10 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:
(*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);
(*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);
(*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite the representative of Liberia to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kofa (Liberia) took a place at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Ouyahia, Acting President, and the other members of the delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia took a place at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite Mr. Nujoma to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nujoma took a place at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings on this item [*2583rd to 2587th, 2589th, 2590th and 2592nd meetings*], I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, the Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Seychelles, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Bessaieh (Algeria), Mr. Van-Dunem (Angola), Mr. Muñiz (Argentina), Mr. Choudhury (Bangladesh), Mr. Moseley (Barbados), Mr. Tshering (Bhutan), Mrs. Carrasco (Bolivia), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Maciel (Brazil), Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Engo (Cameroon), Mr. Lewis (Canada), Mr. Gayama (Congo), Mr. Malmierca (Cuba), Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Mr. César (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Dinka (Ethiopia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Lautenschlager (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Asamoah (Ghana), Mr. Sinclair (Guyana), Mr. Charles (Haiti), Mr. Foldeak (Hungary), Mr. Kusumaatmadja (Indonesia), Mr. Shearer (Jamaica), Mr. Kuroda (Japan), Mr. Kiilu (Kenya), Mr. Abulhassan

(Kuwait), Mr. Vongsay (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Makeka (Lesotho), Mr. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Zain (Malaysia), Mr. Gauci (Malta), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico), Mr. Nyamdoo (Mongolia), Mr. Alaoui (Morocco), Mr. Murargy (Mozambique), Mr. D'Escoto Brockmann (Nicaragua), Mr. Gambari (Nigeria), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Cabrera Jovane (Panama), Mr. Nowak (Poland), Ms. Gonthier (Seychelles), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Wijewardane (Sri Lanka), Mr. Birido (Sudan), Mr. Al-Atassi (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Türkmen (Turkey), Mr. Odaka (Uganda), Mr. Al-Mosfir, (United Arab Emirates), Mr. Mkapa (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia), Mr. Goma (Zambia) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

5. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

6. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is the representative of Barbados. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

7. Mr. MOSELEY (Barbados): My delegation is very grateful for the privilege accorded it of being allowed to speak on this important occasion when the question of Namibia is being debated once again.

8. I call this occasion important for at least two reasons. First, in a general sense, it is important since every time the question of Namibia comes before this Council it involves a picking up of the gauntlet of defiance flung in the face of the whole of the United Nations by an arrogant Pretoria—that Government which is so confident of its support in the corridors of international power that it boasts that no power on earth will make it deviate from the policy of *apartheid* and the perpetual domination of the majority in southern Africa by the minority. Secondly, Mr. President, and for a happier and more private reason, this occasion is important because, for the first time, my delegation sees the Council presided over by the representative of Trinidad and Tobago. I am confident that you will agree that, until some device is invented to lift one or other of our countries and transport it physically to some region outside the Caribbean, our destinies, like our pasts, will remain economically, sociologically and emotionally inextricably bound up. My delegation has every confidence that your ability, your integrity and your experience will provide outstanding guidance to the Council for the conduct of its affairs during the month of June.

9. I must also claim the privilege of congratulating your predecessors, the representatives of Thailand, for the excellent manner in which they guided the work of the Council during the month of May.

10. The question of Namibia has been aired and debated so thoroughly and so often that it seems difficult to conceive why it should still be necessary for so many representatives to say so much on the matter. It seems difficult, too, to believe that so much should have been said for so long with such little result. It is now nearly 19 years since the General Assembly by its resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. In 1978 this Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), which approves a negotiated and agreed plan for the independence of Namibia. And yet, in spite of the numerous strong resolutions that have been adopted both in the Council and in the General Assembly, the people of Namibia are no nearer to independence than they were in 1966. In fact, if the plans of the Pretoria Government are successful, on this very day the people of Namibia may well have moved further from true independence than they were in 1966. That, in brief, is the amazing record of Pretoria's success so far in frustrating the will of the whole international community.

11. I am sure that there are very many delegations which, like mine, believe that what is at stake as we consider the question of Namibia once again is not only independence for the Namibian people but also the very authority of the Council. This, I believe, is one reason why so many Ministers for Foreign Affairs and so many delegations have elected to join their voices in public affirmation of support for the Council, in solidarity with the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and in evidence of a determination that Namibia shall be independent.

12. From all that has been said in the course of this debate there can be no doubt that at the root of the failure of all efforts to achieve the goal of independence for Namibia lie at least two factors: first, there is the determination repeatedly stated by Pretoria that no power on earth can make that Government alter its policy of *apartheid*; and, secondly, there are the natural resources of Namibia, the greed for which compels so many fair-speaking countries to betray their inner conviction that the "grab for Africa", so brazenly practised in the nineteenth century, should now be discontinued—even at the end of the twentieth.

13. Earlier in the course of this debate, those present in the Council chamber were treated to what may best be described as a test of their gullibility when the representative of the Pretoria régime was permitted to speak in the Council. Without daring to mention even once the word *apartheid*, he delivered a statement which must surely rank among the most cynical and specious ever heard in this chamber. Let me illustrate a few examples. In almost his first sentence, he said: "Furthermore, South Africa is an integral part of the southern African region. Whether one likes it or not, this is a fact" [*2583rd meeting, para. 200*]. That out of the mouth of the representative of a Govern-

ment whose creed is *apartheid*. The brazenness of this cynicism fills the mind with a sense of horror. If there was a divine right given to the Afrikaaner to leave his home, travel thousands of miles and take by force, or even otherwise, the lands of other people, surely that right could only have been given upon condition that there should be a fair sharing of and a partnership in the lands usurped. A fair sharing and integration such as would justify the use of the term "integral part" is the very opposite of the abomination that is *apartheid*. By no stretch of the imagination can practitioners and disciples of *apartheid* be considered an integral part of those who are truly African.

14. This Council was told by the representative of Pretoria that countries in the region should abide by certain ground rules. He said:

> "First, no State should make its territory available to individuals or organizations that wish to promote or prepare for violence against other States in the region. The fact is that all the countries of southern Africa have disaffected groups and dissident movements." [*Ibid., para. 201.*]

Apart from the patent absurdity of the implication that there is a single country in the whole world in which there are no disaffected groups or dissident movements, there is the absolutely incredible invitation to regard 20 million black Africans fighting for the most basic of human rights in their own land as a disaffected group or a dissident movement. In the eyes of Pretoria, it is monstrous and unthinkable that those whom they disparagingly refer to as Kaffirs should not sit still and accept genocide as their just fate.

15. The following is another so-called ground rule: "no foreign forces should be permitted to intervene in the region" [*ibid., para. 202*]. No comment is needed here but to say that that is a plain demand that Pretoria should be allowed free rein to stamp Angola and Botswana, Namibia and the rest with the evil hoofmarks of *apartheid* while the world looks on and applauds.

16. The third "ground rule" states: "South Africa believes that the problems of conflict in our region should be solved by peaceful means" [*ibid., para. 203*]. How a problem of conflict can be solved by peaceful means we are not told; but at least the representative of Pretoria recognized that, for millions of black Africans, the problem of *apartheid* on their native soil is a problem of conflict, not just a mere problem. For, contrary to the fraud which the apologists for the system perpetrate upon the naïve and simplistic, *apartheid* is not merely colour prejudice to be solved by simple and peripheral civil rights legislation. It is far more sinister than that—it is a doctrine of perpetual domination, dispossession and degradation.

17. It is not necessary for me to say much more. I would only add for the record that Barbados stands firmly behind the demand that Council resolution 435 (1978) be fully implemented; is unshaken in its support of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the authentic representative of the Namibian people; and is most earnest in its appeal to the contact group to recognize the basic insincerity of the Pretoria régime, which will clearly use every excuse, however fraudulent, to maintain its illegal hold on Namibia.

18. The Council must not impotently surrender to the deceit and arrogance of Pretoria. It must act in the firm belief that the majority of Africans will never accept the application of *apartheid* in their land. The Council must act with the solemn determination that, in spite of the obstacles imposed by greed, Namibia must gain independence if the Council itself is not to be for ever humiliated and rendered altogether impotent.

19. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Lesotho. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

20. Mr. MAKEKA (Lesotho): We wish to express our profound gratitude, through you, Mr. President, to the Council for granting us the opportunity to participate in these very important deliberations on Namibia's future. We are more than delighted to see you presiding over these deliberations and are confident that, under your very able guidance, the Council will live up to its responsibility and adopt a decision that will lead to the implementation of its resolution 435 (1978) and eventual freedom and independence for the Namibian people.

21. Permit me also to pay tribute to the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the representative of Thailand for guiding the Council's work during the month of May.

22. The United Nations as a whole, and its General Assembly and the Security Council in particular, have been seized of the vexing problem of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa since the inception of the Organization. During all these years the international community, through numerous Assembly and Council resolutions, and, indeed, through decisions and opinions of the International Court of Justice, has tried in vain to get South Africa out of Namibia. Council resolution 435 (1978) represented a leap forward in this endeavour, because not only was it fully backed by the Western countries, but it was acceptable to South Africa, at least on paper. It is clear, therefore, that resolution 435 (1978) represents the only acceptable basis for a solution to the problem. Like previous speakers, we would like to add our voice in calling for a speedy implementation of the resolution. The report of the Secretary-General reveals that virtually all outstanding issues have been resolved, except that South Africa still maintains that the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola is a precondition for the implementation of the resolution [*S/17242, para. 45*].

23. From the very first day that the international community called upon South Africa to leave Namibia, South Africa has come up with one excuse after another, designed to frustrate that will and perpetuate its presence there, which has brought untold suffering to the Namibians, whose welfare and freedom are pivotal in this exercise. Not

only is *apartheid* and racial discrimination against the majority of people, who are of non-European origin, being extended from South Africa to Namibia, not only are the immense natural resources of Namibia being depleted by foreign and South African companies, but thousands of Namibians are being killed, imprisoned and forced to flee their country, and more recently they are being forced to join the forces of oppression and occupation. As if this were not enough, South Africa has used and continues to use the territory of Namibia as a base for attacks and acts of aggression against neighbouring countries. The recent events in Cabinda, where South African soldiers en route to commit acts of sabotage were killed, after South Africa had made a fanfare of the withdrawal of its forces from Angola, must convince even non-believers that South Africa is more than ever determined to stay in Namibia.

24. South Africa used all forms of delaying tactics while in fact it was consolidating its position in Namibia. We have seen the Turnhalle agreements, we have heard, and still hear, about the linkage issue of the withdrawal of Cuban forces in Angola, and we now hear about the setting up of a transitional government in Namibia. Where will this lead to? When will South Africa learn that nothing short of resolution 435 (1978) and full sovereign independence for Namibia will be acceptable to the Namibians and to the international community? It should not surprise anybody that the people of Namibia, under the sole, authentic leadership of SWAPO, whose very able President, Mr. Sam Nujoma, is here with us, will continue their armed struggle until victory is achieved. South Africa and those who pat it on the back must know that SWAPO and the people of Namibia will ultimately win, because time is on their side, and their struggle is historic and noble. It follows, herefore, that the so-called transitional government is nothing but a sham, and must be declared null and void by the Council.

25. Those developments are of serious concern not only to my country, which is a neighbour of both South Africa and Namibia, but to the whole world community. The existence of *apartheid* and racial discrimination in South Africa has brought untold difficulties, problems and misery not only for South Africans, but for my country and other neighbouring countries. The recent events, which resulted in massacres of unarmed South Africans who have skin of a different colour from that of their masters, show that the South African Government is far from abandoning *apartheid* in the interest of peace in our region. The callous brutality of *apartheid* in South Africa and in Namibia breeds refugees who flee in huge numbers into my country and other neighbouring countries. In our giving asylum and haven to these refugees, most of whom are school-going children, we bring upon ourselves the wrath of Pretoria. It is sad that South Africa has accorded to itself police powers in the region, hitting left and right in a fury blinded by *apartheid*. In its determination to protect and preserve *apartheid* in South Africa and Namibia, South Africa has become a bully, engaging in terrible acts of aggression against its powerless and poor neighbours. The Council may recall that in 1982 we were forced to appear before it following an attack on our capital city, Maseru, by South Africa, in which 42 innocent refugees and citizens of Lesotho were killed in cold blood.

26. Never before has South Africa defied the Council as it did early in the morning of Friday, 14 June, when South African troops, with impunity and in South Africa's usual high-handed manner, committed yet another act of wanton aggression, this time against Botswana. What is ironic is that the barbarous attack on the capital city of Botswana takes place at a time when the Council is seized of yet other acts of aggression just across the border of Botswana—in Namibia. Indeed, the South African presence in Namibia cannot be described as anything but an act of aggression against the Territory and people of Namibia. That gross violation of sovereignty and territorial integrity of the peace-loving people of Botswana proves beyond reasonable doubt that South Africa cannot be referred to as a force of peace in our region. Not one country has ever attacked South Africa, but South Africa has been the aggressor and a source of insecurity for all of us, and as such it is more than a serious threat to international peace and security.

27. As the Prime Minister of my country stated in his message of support, sympathy and condolences to the Government and people of Botswana,

> "We can understand the indignation of the people of Botswana over this wanton attack, which is all the more objectionable because your Government has consistently advocated peaceful resolution of problems of southern Africa whilst drawing attention to the danger posed to the entire region by the cynical and immoral policy of *apartheid*. We are aware that the allegation that there were ANC [*African National Congress of South Africa*] bases in Gaborone is an empty pretext for the flexing of muscles at the expense of defenceless people by a country which sees itself as a regional super-Power. We reiterate that problems of South Africa are internal, and no venting of emotions by the *apartheid* régime—through attacks on neighbours—shall disguise this truth to the friends of South Africa nor to the world.
>
> "The attack on Botswana is reminiscent of the December 1982 attack on Lesotho and should demonstrate conclusively to the international community that there can be no lasting peace in the southern African region unless the edifice of *apartheid* is destroyed. We are confident that all peace-loving peoples will stand with the people of Botswana and we should like to assure you of our moral support now and in the future until we can live in peace free from the scourge of racism and *apartheid*."

28. The challenge before the Council is immense. The time has come to bring an end to *apartheid*. The Council owes it to humanity to take the necessary steps now to ensure that South Africa gets out of Namibia, because that is the first and vital step towards the freedom of all the people of South Africa and the elimination of *apartheid*. The Charter of the United Nations accords the Council full powers to deal with situations that are a threat to international peace and security. South Africa has proved that it is not only the aggressor in our region, but a destabilizing

force. The questions we pose to the Council are: for how long will South Africa be allowed to defy the Council and the world community regarding this question of Namibia and how many people should South Africa kill, both in South Africa and in the neighbouring countries, before the Council acts?

29. We in southern Africa live in fear and terror and we are worried that the chances of a peaceful solution to the core of the problem are being missed.

30. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Malta. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

31. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): Mr. President, from the islands of Malta and Gozo to the islands of Trinidad and Tobago, I bring you warm and friendly Commonwealth greetings. We are honoured by your distinguished presence here. I personally am encouraged for many reasons, one of them symbolic. I am reminded of one evening at your Mission during my earliest years at the United Nations, way back in 1967. From an intensive conversation in your Ambassador's office, we obtained your country's co-operation and were thereby encouraged to launch the initiative of the then so-called sea-bed item, 18 years ago. I have no doubt that you share my regret that the resultant United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea is not yet fully universal, and that its final shape was not exactly what we had both originally advocated. But by all accounts it is still a monumental achievement. From a hesitant start, then, our two countries were the very first pioneer investors of thought, time and effort in that subsequent gigantic exercise. The 1967 vision of the common heritage of mankind became a reality in 1984. I trust that, similarly, under your guidance this month we shall be equally successful with Namibia and that success will soon be achieved, because much effort has already been expended and the goal is not beyond reach.

32. I have already had the pleasure of complimenting the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the representative of Thailand on the sterling service they rendered the Council in the exercise of the presidency last month. I have pleasure in repeating those compliments today.

33. In his reports, the Secretary-General catalogues the main events of the past seven years. We commend him for his latest objective report [*S/17242*], and even more for his indefatigable efforts to promote progress. His report provides the necessary focus for our attention, and in its concluding paragraph we have the nub of our present predicament.

34. On going through our own records I find that, as a member of the Council, I stated Malta's view on this particular item twice in 1983—on 31 May and 27 October [*2449th and 2480th meetings*]. I do not wish to repeat myself today.

35. Instead I have listened with deep sympathy to the interventions of others, made at such a high level, and I find in those statements an unmistakeable expression of depth of feeling and conviction that no further obstacle should stand in the way of early independence for Namibia.

36. With the exception of one single dissonant voice, from the four quarters of the globe—with facts, eloquence and conviction—the clarion call for progress in the unqualified terms of resolution 435 (1978) has been reaffirmed.

37. It is therefore sufficient for me to repeat that we share those convictions and to regret that independence is not yet at hand. It is also clear where the difficulties lie and that only one obstacle stands squarely in the way.

38. I am being deliberately restrained in my language. This is not because I am not passionately for immediate independence for Namibia, not because I do not abhor *apartheid*, not because I do not share the feelings of outrage at the violence in southern Africa, at the repressive practices of the South African authorities, at the delaying tactics persistently being introduced in the delicate negotiating process. I do so for other reasons. I do not wish to add fuel to the fire, nor do I wish to give South Africa any pretext conveniently to pretend that the Security Council is on one of its periodic public exercises of pillorying South Africa's policies—a self-serving shield behind which, abetted by some barons of the press, South Africa tries to seek shelter. If the whole world is expressing dissatisfaction, then South Africa should examine its own conscience and listen to its eternal whisperings.

39. The South African authorities would in fact only be deluding themselves and their people if they failed to heed the widespread determination of countries to promote a peaceful settlement of the Namibian issue and to bring about racial equality and harmony inside South Africa itself. This message is constantly gaining strength and conviction. To do less would be to fail in our duty to respect and to promote fundamental human rights.

40. It is therefore, as I have said on previous occasions, in South Africa's own long-term interest to swim with the tide. The front-line States have shown remarkable restraint. SWAPO has been constantly receptive to constructive suggestions, and even neighbouring countries, whose sovereignty has repeatedly been militarily violated by South Africa, have remained dedicated to a peaceful settlement, the latest demonstrations of good faith once more having been provided by Angola and, even more recently, while this very debate was in progress, by Botswana. We convey our deepest sympathy to these latest victims of South African aggression and condemn the incidents.

41. In the present cycle of violence, in the midst of gloom, even of despair, have we no source of hope? I still believe we do. What are our assets? First, the tremendous work already done and the tangible progress achieved; secondly, the determination of influential countries to continue their daunting, and, if I may say so, somewhat thankless task of persuasion and reassurances against the negative attitude of the South African authorities still ille-

gally occupying Namibia; thirdly, the dedicated efforts of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative; fourthly, the essential unity of the Council behind the settlement plan; fifthly, the common interest of all parties to bring about a peaceful and early regional settlement; and last, but certainly not least, the staunch determination of Namibians to secure their independence, led by SWAPO.

42. As never before, an additional powerful factor is coming into play. It was succinctly put by Anthony Lewis in his article in *The New York Times* last Thursday. He said: "The patience of most Americans for the official racism, inhumanity and violence of South Africa has run out." It had already run out in many other countries long ago. Influential citizens, corporations, religious institutions, trade unions and even state legislators are acting independently, bypassing the indifference of their own Governments to the deplorable present situation.

43. We in Malta have refrained from aiding, recognizing or even establishing contact with South Africa in any way in the past. This we will continue to do until Namibia becomes independent and until *apartheid* in South Africa is abolished. In the meantime, students from Namibia mix happily with others in our university and technical colleges. We will also respect any new decisions to be taken by the Security Council after the current debate. And we are ready to do even more.

44. On the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, we have asked ourselves some questions. What can we do to help the United Nations secure its objective in Namibia? Is there not something, no matter how small, within our modest means, that may be considered constructive and practical, and that we can offer so as to give a new momentum to the negotiating process that still lies ahead and that is all the more urgently needed now? We have found the answer, the objective and the inspiration in the very first article of our modern Constitution, which states that Malta is a democratic republic founded on work, on respect for the fundamental rights and freedom of the individual.

45. Malta is at the centre of Europe and Africa. We have benefited from the civilizations of both continents, as well as from Asia. We were a geological land bridge between the two continents in prehistoric times. We act as a political bridge to bring the two continents closer today. We constantly search for the ways of peace, and we are determined to work actively for its attainment.

46. To strive peacefully for an early solution to the question of Namibia falls therefore naturally in line with our foreign policy objectives. We derive some encouragement from the fact that, only a few years ago, in a largely similar situation of unilateral declaration of independence by Ian Smith of Rhodesia, it was in Malta that the breakthrough preceding Zimbabwe's independence was successfully negotiated, quietly, in contacts between the parties concerned. We have also acquired special expertise in comparative constitutional law, in electoral and voting systems and in human rights legislation, which could be useful at least in bridging the gap between the parties on these aspects. We are therefore prepared to offer the same facilities, the same expertise, the same zeal and dedication to the Secretary-General, to the parties directly involved and to the members of the contact group, at any time considered useful, in whichever way may be considered most appropriate for quiet diplomacy, and for as long as necessary until a breakthrough is achieved. In doing so, we would be furthering our own policy of promoting reconciliation, of aiding the United Nations, and of upholding the prestige of the Security Council, thus responding in a modest but practical way to the appeal of the Secretary-General. We have no axes to grind; we have no vested interests to defend, other than a dedication towards success. We hope that the busy bustle of Valletta, and the "gentle temper" of the surrounding summer sea will help to secure progress.

47. Given South Africa's attitude, it is unfortunately only too likely that—publicly at least—it will continue to ignore the urgings even of its best friends. We can be sure, though, that it cannot forever ignore its own long-term self-interest. If, as it claims, it is really anxious to attain the best interests of the Namibian people, then surely there is no better way than to give them the freedom of choice by secret ballot under international supervision. Then the beloved country will cry no more.

48. Concurrently but separately—even if only in the narrow interest of their own economic imperatives—the South African authorities should attend to internal reform, to abolish *apartheid*, to free the whites from shame, the blacks from pain, and all its citizens from fear. Then, too, the people of South Africa will cry no more. Then—and only then—will South Africa regain the esteem of its friends, the respect and friendly co-operation of its neighbours and peace in its region. Then—and only then—will it have earned its rightful place among the family of nations. Perhaps—only perhaps—the minimalist social changes recently introduced in South Africa portray a delayed dawning of a new understanding of its national and international responsibilities. It is our fervent hope, in any case, that positive change is really on the way.

49. I thank you, Mr. President, and all the members of the Council, for graciously having permitted me to speak on this item today.

50. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

51. Mr. RAJAIE KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Congratulations, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency. It so happened that, just when you undertook the task, one of the heaviest of all international complications also worked its way to the Council. However, I am glad that the problem, notwithstanding its impossible character, has fallen into capable hands.

52. Your predecessor, the representative of Thailand, too, conducted the affairs of the Council ably and effi-

ciently. My delegation wishes to thank him for all the sincerity and effort he devoted to the work of the Council.

53. Council resolution 435 (1978) seems to enjoy universal support—universal support because even the United States, though in a lip-service manner, claims to agree with it. That resolution is almost eight years old; yet it has not been implemented. The question is: if everybody, including the United States, is in full support of that resolution, why has it remained absolutely devoid of any operational significance? What is the obstacle and who has been obstructing its implementation throughout those eight painfully slow-moving years?

54. The Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was adopted in 1960, that is, 25 years ago. Its twenty-fifth anniversary was celebrated in Tunisia last May. The United Nations is celebrating its fortieth anniversary. However, colonial domination over the people of Namibia is much older than even the United Nations itself. They have been under direct colonial yoke for a century; that is two and a half times longer than the entire history of the United Nations. None the less, they still have patiently to endure United States imperialism, simply because as declared by the United States representative on 12 June 1985, "the United States remains dedicated to this goal" and is "actively involved in negotiations to create conditions to allow implementation of the United Nations plan to proceed" [*2587th meeting, para. 69*].

55. Why after a century of suffering and of deprivation of the basic rights to freedom, do the oppressed people of Namibia have to wait for the "creative intelligence" of the United States to remain involved in those negotiations to create conditions to allow the implementation of the United Nations plan to proceed? The answer is to be found in the 350 American companies which are plundering the property of the region and which wish to preserve the *status quo* as long as possible in order to exploit those resources as long as possible. The answer is to be found in resources such as uranium, cobalt, manganese, platinum and many other strategic metals, which lie dormant in the land of Namibia.

56. The answer resides behind the fact that only last year American and other companies, from the gold mines of the region alone, benefited by more than $850 million, and the *apartheid* régime too benefited by more than $1.1 billion in the form of taxes alone. The United States does believe in the independence of Namibia, but it also maintains that all the Namibians

> "should have the right to be heard, to express their views freely, to form political parties. They also have the right, as provided in resolution 435 (1978), to stand for election to represent their people. By the same token, however, none can be permitted to take power into their own hands, or to proclaim themselves the leaders of the Namibian people or the government of Namibia. Rather, it is for the people of Namibia to chose their own leaders in free and fair elections under United Nations supervision and control."

What I have read out is a quotation from the statement of the representative of the United States. It continues: "This remains our goal" [*ibid., para. 74*]. By that, the United States Administration simply means that, if the people of Namibia are to have a government of their own, it must be some puppet régime which would still fulfil some of the demands of the United States multinational corporations and permit the substitution of colonialism by neo-colonialism. And since some other countries have a modest share in those multinational corporations, we can therefore appreciate why some other innocent-looking people who have been hiding their faces behind the United States have generously condoned a United States veto and have agreed with it on the necessity of patience for finding and creating some suitable conditions to allow implementation of the plan to proceed.

57. Why is it that when Americans are hijacked the United States savagely threatens retaliation against third countries, but that when the entire nation of Namibia has been held hostage by the United States for 100 years the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations—the only guarantee for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978)—cannot be implemented? It is for that same reason that draft resolution S/17270 includes operative paragraph 14, which is a face-saving device for the Council.

58. The fact is that the claws of United States imperialism are squeezing the throat of the Middle East and the southern region of Africa to death, and the two Zionist régimes, one occupying Palestine and the other, the *apartheid* régime of Pretoria, are evil instruments of that inhumane, deadly purpose. Those who have installed those two régimes in those parts of the world are well equipped to support their agents here.

59. The people of Namibia are probably therefore convinced that the Council is not the organ from which authorization for the independence of Namibia can issue, in spite of the enormous goodwill that the present composition of the Council demonstrates. The present draft resolution is therefore as good as any—as good as resolution 435 (1978)—for neither one nor the other offer anything to the people of Namibia.

60. United States imperialism is a gigantic mountain, and the diplomatic pressures exerted on it here are like soft, beautiful spring rainfall. The diplomats of the United Nations who want to break United States imperialism by means of resolutions are like soft-hearted, innocent and primitive people hoping for the total erosion of that mountain by the annual spring rain. How many years will we have to wait? The answer is: for a complete geological period to pass. We have gone through three of them since the creation of the earth and the fourth is not yet completed. Some small soft hills and hilltops can be washed away naturally through annual rainfall, but huge mountains cannot be destroyed by United States resolutions. They may need dynamite.

61. We, the oppressed people of the third world, must therefore count on the armed struggle of the Namibian

people and the oppressed non-white majority of South Africa. The enemy must be fully convinced that it faces the iron fist of those deprived, oppressed peoples, who have nothing to lose anyway. And unless and until the militant peoples of southern Africa and Namibia, as well as the oppressed Moslems of Palestine in the Middle East, confront the enemy violently and forcefully, we here shall have to be patient and keep the United States involved and further involved in negotiations to create conditions to allow for the implementation of the United Nations plan to proceed.

62. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Argentina. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

63. Mr. MUÑIZ (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is indeed a great pleasure to see you, Sir, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Trinidad and Tobago, presiding over these important meetings of the Council. Gradually, Argentina and Trinidad and Tobago have been developing bonds of friendship and co-operation. Those bonds are based upon our belonging to the same region, where the fate of each country is linked to the fate of every other, and where we all support the same democratic and anti-colonialist principles. Those bonds will surely produce mutually beneficial results. My Government is convinced that regional solidarity is vital to the economic and social development of the Latin American countries and the countries of the Caribbean, something all of our peoples seek as a matter of priority.

64. I wish also to pay a tribute to the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the representative of Thailand, who guided the work of the Council so effectively during the month of May.

65. The disturbing impasse in the process towards the independence of Namibia fully justifies the convening of this series of meetings. Despite the years that have passed since the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), the sole acceptable basis for a peaceful, final solution of the question of Namibia, there has been little reason to believe that we are any closer to the end of this serious conflict—whose persistence poses a threat to international peace and security—than we were seven years ago. On the contrary, certain activities and positions of the South African Government appear to be aimed at perpetuating the colonial situation in Namibia or, at least, at permitting only a partial and conditional independence.

66. It is logical, then, that, together with other non-aligned countries, we should state our frustration and reiterate our request that the Council adopt new decisions.

67. In this connection, it is appropriate to recall that two years ago, when the Council reaffirmed the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, it also agreed that if South Africa continued to oppose the full implementation of resolution 435 (1978), additional measures under the Charter of the United Nations would have to be adopted.

68. Although South Africa has claimed willingness to contribute to Namibia's final accession to independence and has seemed to recognize the need for this to take place in an internationally acceptable framework, the United Nations has ample reason to wonder about the sincerity of these declared intentions. Events such as the installation of an interim administration in Windhoek raise significant new obstacles to the achievement of that objective. Moreover, Namibia's territory continues to be used as a base for operations on the sovereign territory of Angola. The leaders and supporters of SWAPO, recognized by the General Assembly as the sole, authentic representative of the Namibian people, continue to be persecuted.

69. South Africa, above all, is insisting on conditions which have been repeatedly rejected by the United Nations. The linkage of the independence of Namibia with relations between South Africa and Angola is incompatible with the quest for regional harmony. The Namibian people has the inalienable right to full self-determination and independence, without pre-conditions or delays. It is time for Pretoria to adopt a truly constructive approach and make the express, formal commitment to implement the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

70. Along with other non-aligned countries, Argentina vigorously condemns the illegal colonial occupation of Namibia and reiterates its firm support for the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence and to the establishment of a just, democratic and egalitarian society in the Territory.

71. As we have said before, the present situation in Namibia is an outright challenge to the credibility and effectiveness of the United Nations, that is, to the credibility and effectiveness of an international order based on justice and aimed at ensuring the maintenance of international peace and security and at making possible the development of harmonious relations and co-operation among States. The policy of South Africa, with its colonialist and racist overtones, is offensive to the rest of Africa and to the conscience of all mankind, and is simply incompatible with such an order. Therefore, the Council must react appropriately.

72. The special responsibility of the United Nations with respect to Namibia will be met, and the moral authority of the Council and of the Organization preserved, only if the Council takes measures which will help hasten the long overdue independence of Namibia, in keeping with resolution 435 (1978). If it continues, the present state of affairs will prove dangerous for the stability of southern Africa. We cannot discount the possibility of further, more serious confrontations.

73. Argentina therefore joins in the appeal of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries that the Council should take action beyond that which has been adopted in the past, under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

74. Putting an end to the Namibian tragedy and eradicating totally and finally the odious system of *apartheid* must

be priorities for the international community. The persistence of these serious conflicts dangerously jeopardizes stability in international relations and generates tension to which Council, with its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, must respond quickly and effectively.

75. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the United Arab Emirates. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

76. Mr. AL-MOSFIR (United Arab Emirates) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Permit me at the outset to convey to you, Sir, the great pleasure of my delegation at seeing you presiding over the deliberations this month. We are confident that your diplomatic skill and political experience will enable you to lead the work of the Council to a successful conclusion.

77. I wish also to convey my sincere appreciation to the delegation of Thailand, led by its Minister for Foreign Affairs, for the excellent and efficient way in which they guided the work of the Council last month, during a time of many developments in different parts of the world.

78. I take this opportunity to express our deep gratitude to the Secretary-General for his tireless, dedicated efforts towards the early independence of Namibia. We reaffirm that we shall continue to give him support and co-operation in his work to promote the principles of the United Nations.

79. While this Council was seized of this question last week, the racist Government of South Africa launched an armed attack against the independent State of Botswana. That act of aggression took place after statements had been made in the Council by the representatives of some major Powers, in the light of which that racist Government realized that it would be safe to defy the international will and therefore carried out that act of aggression against the friendly Republic of Botswana.

80. The Council is called upon to react to this blatant defiance of its authority and responsibility towards the international community, that is to say, the maintenance of security and stability throughout the world. We in the United Arab Emirates condemn and deplore all forms of aggression. We call upon the Council to adopt resolutions commensurate with its grave responsibilities. Hence our immediate request is for the Council to invoke Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations at the end of its deliberations on the question entitled "The situation in Namibia".

81. At the end of this year, 1985, 100 years will have elapsed since the Berlin Conference, at which the colonialist division of the African continent took place and the colonial domination of Namibia started. The illegal occupation of that Territory by the racist South African régime has continued for 100 years.

82. Since 1978 the Council has held more than 130 meetings devoted to the consideration of crises afflicting the peoples of southern Africa. The Security Council, the General Assembly and international organizations have adopted innumerable resolutions condemning and deploring the practices of the racist Government of South Africa against the Namibian people and the rightful owners of South Africa. These resolutions have also condemned the acts of aggression carried out by the racist minority régime of Pretoria against the front-line States.

83. These resolutions were supported by all countries that cherish freedom, justice and peace. Nevertheless, some major Powers shamelessly oppose them. What is strange is that those who support the Government of South Africa in international forums and oppose the imposition of global sanctions against that Fascist, racist Government, in accordance with the Charter, are those who claim to be the custodians of the freedom, democracy and independence of peoples.

84. What is freedom from their point of view? It is the freedom of the Fascist minority to manipulate the destiny of the majority and forcefully to plunder the resources of that majority without let or hindrance. What is democracy to them? It is the power of that puppet minority to force others into subjugation, even by murder, starvation and displacement.

85. True democracy is that which protects the human being in any part of the world against exploitation. It is that which upholds human rights and human dignity. It is that which deters the development corporations from plundering the riches of the nations.

86. What is the concept of the independence of peoples for those mighty Powers? It is simply the imposition of hegemony over countries, the plunder of their riches and the subjugation of their citizens to serve the invader.

87. To be true to history before the Council, we should like to remind the mighty of today, who believe that their might is invincible, and who believe that their racist allies in South Africa and occupied Palestine—the so-called Israel—will continue to enjoy their unlimited support, that their reading of the history of peoples is mistaken, that the history they read is false.

88. All struggling peoples have achieved victory, in spite of the weapons used to oppress them. The struggling people of Viet Nam achieved its victory, in spite of all the destructive weapons used against it. It did unify its territory and it did build its independent State.

89. As regards the great people of Algeria, France claimed that it had the power to force it into subjugation. It practised the first political air piracy operation in modern history against its national leaders, so as to dissuade that people from the achievement of its objectives of freedom and independence. But in the end France realized that might was not the right path, but that to be responsive to the will of the Algerian people was the path to the achievement of peace and freedom.

90. The United Kingdom believed that, by detaining or exiling Mahatma Gandhi and dispersing his supporters away from India, it would be able to keep the most precious jewel in the British crown under control. But the heroic people of India, under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, managed to restore the independence of the Indian sub-continent from the then strongest country in the world.

91. The same is true of the Hitler Nazi forces which fell before the strikes of the European peoples and their allies who aspired to rid themselves of oppression and humiliation.

92. All peoples have learned a basic lesson: the forces of liberation against invasion and occupation cannot be defeated by any Power, however big. These are the lessons of history we offer to those who have been intoxicated by force, who have supported wrong against right, who have supported the minority against the majority, who have protected the new fascism in Pretoria and Palestine, supplying it with money, arms and political support, so as to oppress the peoples of those regions. But peoples cannot be oppressed forever. They may be knocked down but never knocked out. They might fall down, but wounds soon heal and they come back like an irresistible wind that blows obstacles away.

93. The Council is meeting at the initiative of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries to affirm once again that non-aligned countries and peace and freedom-loving countries totally and categorically reject the prevarication, procrastination and linkage theory of the racist Government of South Africa and reject the continued obstruction by that régime of the implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978), embodying a clear plan for the independence of Namibia.

94. The United Arab Emirates wishes to reaffirm as follows its position on this question.

95. First, we call upon the members of the Council, in particular its permanent members, to work in an honest and responsible manner for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) immediately and unconditionally, so as to enable the Namibian people to determine their own future and to build their independent State, including Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands and all the offshore islands.

96. Secondly, we call for the immediate withdrawal of the racist Pretoria forces from all Namibian territory and the termination of its occupation of the country. We support the application of Chapter VII of the Charter against the Government of South Africa for its non-compliance with Security Council and General Assembly resolutions.

97. Thirdly, the Government of South Africa and its Western allies have chosen to inject a new condition into the Namibian independence issue, that is, the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. That is interference in the internal affairs of an independent, sovereign State, and we cannot but categorically reject interference in the internal affairs of any State from any quarter whatsoever. We totally reject the attempt and wish of the South African Government to establish a puppet "interim administration" that would carry out the wishes of that racist régime and give a false image of autonomy.

98. Fourthly, we affirm that attempts to reach a solution outside the United Nations are in contravention of the wish of the Namibian people and their legitimate representative, SWAPO.

99. Fifthly, my country unreservedly supports the national liberation movement, SWAPO, as the sole, legitimate representative of the Namibian people. We condemn aggression or the threat of aggression against the front-line States from any quarter whatsoever.

100. In conclusion, I reaffirm the request that this Council put an end to the behaviour and acts of the racists of Pretoria, and respond positively to the genuine wishes of the Namibian people. We express our great appreciation for the valiant role played by hero Sam Nujoma, the President of SWAPO, and congratulate SWAPO's leadership and fighters on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the struggle for freedom and independence. We are confident that their struggle will be crowned with success.

101. The PRESIDENT: I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of Trinidad and Tobago.

102. I address the Council in my capacity as Minister for Foreign Affairs of Trinidad and Tobago and do so having sat as President for several days and having heard representatives' statements on this burning question of the continued occupation of Namibia by South Africa—the question indeed of the continued defiance by South Africa of the will of the Council and of the United Nations as a whole.

103. This is Trinidad and Tobago's first term as a member of the Council. It is also the first time that we preside over its deliberations. This is therefore a signal honour for my country. We deem it particularly fitting that the first debate under our presidency should be on the question of Namibia, for Trinidad and Tobago, itself a former colony, has been unswerving in its support of the inalienable right of all peoples to self-determination and independence.

104. Trinidad and Tobago expresses its sincere appreciation to the Secretary-General for his deep personal commitment to the Namibian cause and his untiring and undaunted efforts to bring about the implementation of United Nations resolutions and decisions on Namibia.

105. We have noted the ardour, the commitment, the depth of feeling, even the unmistakable impatience and sense of frustration in the statements delivered in the Council on this issue. These are inevitable reactions to any consideration of the plight of the Namibian people and the continued brutal denial of justice which they experience.

Our frustration is compounded by recent events in southern Africa, including today's installation of an illegal puppet administration in Windhoek, the unwarranted incursion into Angolan territory earlier this month, and last week's brutal attack on Botswana which took place even while the Council was discussing a question of vital importance to peace and stability in that region.

106. Yet we have heard a statement by South Africa which makes bold to suggest that, if only the international community would co-operate with it, be patient and trusting, then all the questions relating to Namibia would be resolved. However, South Africa made no reference to its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and to the Council and its several resolutions. The statement implied that the horrors of *apartheid* in South Africa, transferred to Namibia, are but simple aberrations for which that racist régime could in any event find justification.

107. *Apartheid*, which is indistinguishable from slavery as practised by earlier colonialists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, has been repeatedly rejected by the international community. The General Assembly has denounced it as a crime against humanity, while the Security Council has characterized it as being abhorrent to the conscience of mankind. Yet, South Africa persists in applying this heinous system to a Territory over which it has absolutely no right of administration.

108. We have noted the references to the many resolutions adopted year after year by the Council. They are resolutions which deal with the fundamental issues of freedom, liberty and justice—principles which form the cornerstone of the constitutions of Member States.

109. Must we, then, in this fortieth year of the founding of the United Nations and in the consideration of the question of Namibia by the international community, continue to be thwarted in our efforts to bring freedom and independence to the people of Namibia? In 1966, in its determination to bring about a just settlement of the Namibian question, the United Nations revoked South Africa's Mandate over the Territory and assumed direct responsibility for it. Notwithstanding that and the adoption of some 21 Council resolutions, the Pretoria régime continues to defy the authority of the United Nations and to maintain its illegal occupation of Namibia.

110. Trinidad and Tobago believes that it is time for the Council and the international community to take effective and definitive action to bring this unhappy episode to an end.

111. In past deliberations the Council provided a framework for terminating South Africa's illegal occupation and effecting the independence of Namibia. Resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) contain the essential elements for meeting these objectives: the withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia; the transfer of power to the people of Namibia as one political entity, through free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations; and the establishment of a United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) with a civilian and military component.

112. The Government of Trinidad and Tobago has consistently taken the position that the only acceptable plan of action for achieving Namibian independence remains that approved in resolution 435 (1978), amplifying as it does the principles embodied in resolution 385 (1976). However, it is a matter of deep regret that, years after the Council approved the detailed plan under which political power would be transferred to the people of Namibia with the assistance of the United Nations, the realization of the independence of Namibia continues to elude us.

113. It is universally recognized that one of the major achievements of the United Nations has been in the area of decolonization. Trinidad and Tobago has had the honour of serving for many years on the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, including three years as its Chairman. Since the inception of the Special Committee we have seen many former colonies emerge from colonial status. For us, for most members of the Council and for the United Nations as a whole, the observance by the international community of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples is marred by the continued subjugation of the people of Namibia by the South African occupation régime. The people of Namibia continue to be oppressed, brutalized and exploited; their resources continue to be plundered and despoiled.

114. It must now be manifest that South Africa does not intend to relinquish its hold on Namibia, nor to respect the authority of the United Nations. Two months ago the Pretoria régime announced its decision to establish a so-called interim government in illegally occupied Namibia. The Security Council responded with a presidential statement on 3 May [*S/17151*], declaring the establishment of the so-called interim government to be null and void. That statement and international condemnation notwithstanding, South Africa has proceeded to install the so-called interim government. That manoeuvre by South Africa constitutes clear defiance of the decisions of the Council, particularly resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). It is further evidence of South Africa's total disregard of the demands of the Namibian people for self-determination and independence. That action by South Africa is an attempt to perpetuate the system of *apartheid*, with all its odious characteristics, in a territory for which the United Nations is directly responsible.

115. The full implementation of the provisions of resolution 435 (1978) is dependent upon the co-operation of South Africa, but can we depend upon South Africa, which has imposed a most brutal and dehumanizing régime, inimical to the interests of black people, to co-operate in the introduction of a liberal, democratic system in Namibia, whose population is predominantly black? Should the United Nations, and the Council in particular, stand by without taking any direct action?

116. It is clear that the policy of constructive engagement, propounded as a substitute for direct action, has failed, and that policies of dialogue, political support and economic co-operation have not produced their desired effect. Even the unilateral action of certain Member States to isolate South Africa, based on their perception and assessment of the most effective way of combating the régime's defiance of international law and of responding to the overwhelmingly censorious burden of international opinion, as reflected in decisions of, *inter alia*, the Security Council, the General Assembly, the International Court of Justice, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Organization of African Unity, has failed to have any real impact on South Africa's recalcitrance.

117. The determination of South Africa to maintain its oppressive and illegal occupation of Namibia constitutes a grave threat to international peace and security. For as long as the illegality of that occupation continues, southern Africa will not have peace, the dignity of Africa will continue to be outraged, the will of the international community to be affronted and disrespected and the integrity and credibility of the Council to be subverted. The failure of the United Nations to deal decisively with South Africa over the question of Namibia forces the conclusion, which has been adumbrated in the course of our debate, that options for non-violent solutions may soon run out. The United Nations must of necessity, therefore, institute more effective measures to put an end to the intransigence of South Africa and avoid confrontation, violence and bloodshed.

118. Trinidad and Tobago is of the view that it is imperative that the Security Council move with dispatch on this matter and mandate the Secretary-General to initiate contact with South Africa with a view to finalizing the choice of the electoral system to be used for elections for the Constituent Assembly, under United Nations supervision and control. The Secretary-General should also be mandated to take appropriate steps for the introduction of UNTAG into Namibia, as provided for in resolution 435 (1978).

119. Trinidad and Tobago is pleased to associate itself with the Programme of Action [*see S/17184 and Corr.1, annex*] adopted by the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, held at New Delhi last April, and to be one of the six Council members, all States members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, which are sponsors of the draft resolution before us [*S/17284*]. It provides a clear-cut, step-by-step approach for early implementation of the internationally agreed plan for Namibian independence. We urge all members of the Council to support the draft and in so doing send a clear message to the Pretoria régime that its machinations and prevarications will be tolerated no longer.

120. History has shown that the realization of the rights and aspirations of a people to freedom and independence may be delayed, but can never be denied. The history of Namibia is the history of a trust unceasingly betrayed. It is the history of a people struggling against foreign occupation, oppression and exploitation to realize their inalienable right to self-determination and independence; of a people waiting, so far in vain, for the realization of their hopes and aspirations and the implementation of the will of the international community. Let us act now, together, to bring an end to this sad phase in world history and usher in a new dawn of freedom for the people of Namibia, and in so doing assert the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security.

121. I now resume my function as PRESIDENT.

122. I call on the representative of the United States, who has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

123. Mr. CLARK (United States of America): I should just like to say that, particularly at this time, we find the remarks about hostages made today in the Council by the representative of Iran to be false, disturbing and tasteless.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.